

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/774,423	NAGASHIMA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Marianne L. Padgett	1792	

**All Participants:**

(1) Marianne L. Padgett.

(2) James Hamilton.

**Status of Application:** Restriction required

(3) Secretary.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 8 January 2008

**Time:** Afternoon

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

NA

Claims discussed:

Those of record

Prior art documents discussed:

NA

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

**MARIANNE PADGETT  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

The examiner had noted that the office's records were inconsistent, with Palm saying that the restriction requirement had been mailed on 7/20/2007, while the scanned file showed no such documents or other documents since filing, hence the Examiner made a call to James Hamilton, left a message to this effect & asked if any written restriction requirement had been received. Applicant's files were checked & no restriction requirement was found therein, and it was noted that if properly mailed the document should have been received electronically. Public Pair was also checked & no copy of the restriction requirement found therein.

(Since discussions with applicant's representatives, it is noted that scanning personnel have since found the papers & scanned them into the application file, but this does not correct the question of appropriate mailing.)

Due to apparent errors, the restriction is being remailed & time restarted.